

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,398	YOKOTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Paradiso	3721	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John R. Paradiso.

(3) _____.

(2) Nomugi Tomoyori.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 July 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: HIRATA.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant explained that HIRATA does not show the limitation described in claim 1 lines 3-4 "a vertical bag-manufacturing and packaging machine that is configured to manufacture a bag by sealing a tubular continuous packaging material filled with items to be packaged,...". Applicant further pointed out that HIRATA can not show this since HIRATA discloses providing empty bags to the element Examiner seems to be reading as the orientation control unit.

Examiner agreed, but also pointed out that the "vertical bag-manufacturing machine" is not described in the claims in terms of structure of such a machine, and so HIRATA may read on the claim, when read in its broadest reasonable interpretation."

Applicant acknowledged this but pointed out that since claim 1 recites "a vertical bag-manufacturing machine" (line 3) "that is configured to manufacture a bag" (lines 3-4) "by sealing a tubular continuous packaging material filled with items" lines.. " (lines 4-5); and a "conveyance unit" is claimed (line 7); since a "drop orientation control unit disposed between the vertical bag-manufacturing and packaging machine and the conveyance unit" (lines 10-11), then the bags must be filled prior to being passed to the orientation control unit.

Examiner agreed.

Applicant pointed out that HIRATA also does not show the claim limitation of "maintaining the drop orientation of the bag..." (claim 1 lines 13-14). Examiner agreed that unit (8) of HIRATA does change the orientation while the bags are in said unit.

Applicant will submit these arguments formally.

Examiner will consider these arguments and conduct further search, as necessary.